

## REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated November 13, 2009. Claims 1-4, 8 and 9 are presented for examination, of which Claim 1 is in independent form and has been amended to define still more clearly what Applicants regard as their invention. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0217871 (Chao et al.) in view of U.S. Patent 5,798,756 (Yoshida et al.), Claim, 4 as being unpatentable over *Chao* in view of *Yoshida* and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,128,499 (Morita), and Claims 8 and 9, as being unpatentable over *Chao* in view of *Yoshida* and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0086149 (Kawai).

Applicants submit that the independent claim, together with its dependent claims, is patentable over the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

The nature of the present invention has been adequately discussed in the Amendment of August 26, 2009, and it is not believed necessary to repeat that discussion in full. Applicants note that according to certain aspects of the present invention, a plurality of multiple closed-loop circuits are laid out on a matrix-type liquid crystal panel along the X-direction and the Y-direction (para. [0002]).

Claim 1 recites, among other features, “in the coordinate detection drive mode, the closed-loop forming circuits disposed at two ends of the display panel connect at least a pair of terminals of the X interconnecting lines in each end to form a multiple closed loop including multiple parallel loops of the X interconnecting lines.”

This feature is not believed to be disclosed or suggested in *Chao* and *Yoshida*, considered separately or in any permissible combination.

As Applicants understand, *Chao* relates to a pointer system of a digitizer tablet comprising a set of inductive loops (*see* Abstract). To determine the position of a wireless pointer, a scanning process is first performed to identify the range where the wireless pointer is positioned. An inductive loop in this range that has been induced most intensely is then made to emit signals repeatedly. After a period of transient energy storage, corresponding resonant signals are emitted and received by other inductive loops that are near the inductive loop. The precise position of the wireless pointer can then be calculated.

Specifically, each inductive loop has an initial terminal and an ending terminal connected to the ground in the same way, which means that it is a single, open loop (*see* para. [0032] and Fig. 2 for a clear view). Therefore, contrary to the Examiner's interpretation, Applicants believe that *Chao* does not disclose or suggest any “multiple closed loop including multiple parallel loops,” as recited in Claim 1.

Even if *Yoshida* is deemed to show all that it is cited for, that document would not provide what is missing from *Chao* as a reference against Claim 1. Accordingly, Claim 1 is believed patentable over *Chao* and *Yoshida*, considered separately or in any permissible combination.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicants' opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claim. Therefore, the independent claim is believed to be allowable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from Claim 1, and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

This Amendment After Final Action is believed clearly to place this application in condition for allowance and its entry is therefore believed proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. In any event, however, entry of this Amendment After Final Action, as an earnest effort to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leonard P Diana/  
Leonard P. Diana  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No.: 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
1290 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10104-3800  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200  
FCHS\_WS 4365285\_1.DOC